

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/877,128	06/11/2001	Sang Seok Lee	049128-5010	2063	
9629 7	590 11/26/2004		EXAMINER		
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			KENNEDY, JENNIFER M		
WASHINGTON, DC 20004	**	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2812	,	

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, •	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/877,128	LEE, SANG SEOK				
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Jennifer M. Kennedy	2812				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
 a)						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
	3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 1 and 5.					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 4, 5, and 8-10</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
——————————————————————————————————————						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:		Jennifer M. Kennedy Patent Examiner Art Unit: 3813				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 2. NOTE: The added limitations of forming the protrusion of "indium tin oxide" and the added claims require further search and/or consideration. Applicants argue that the amendment would not require further consideration since indium tin oxide was previously considered in dependent claims 8 and 9. The examiner notes that indium tin oxide was just one material of a list of materials cited in claims 8 and 9. Therefore, the restriction to indium tin oxide in independent claim narrows the scope of the claim, thus requiring further search and consideration.